

amend the specification with a brief reference and discussion of the figure. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been or will be submitted.

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 112, first and second paragraph**

No ( The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-7 under 35 USC 112, both first and second paragraphs. The Applicants have submitted amend claims 1-7 to overcome these rejections. The Examiner expressed particular concern about the expression “phase-difference.” The Applicants wish point out that US Patent 5,327,285 (‘285) by Faris, one of the inventors herein, was “incorporated herein by reference.” If one skilled in the art reads both the instant specification and the ‘285 patent which is considered part of the instant application by its incorporation by reference, one skilled in the art would understand that “phase-difference film” is the same as “linearly polarized film.” Therefore the Applicants have used “linearly polarized film” throughout the claims. This appears to be a result of a translation error from the Japanese to English. If required by the Examiner, the Applicants are prepared to incorporate information from the ‘285 patent into the instant specification as well as change “phase-difference” to “linear polarized” throughout the specification.

The Applicants also believe when one reads both the instant specification and the ‘285 patent it will become clear to one skilled in the stereoscopic display art the relationship between left eye and right eye display parts.

The Applicants have replaced claim 3, 4, 5, and 7 within the amended claims to make the term appropriate members clearer. Additionally the term appropriate members is defined at the bottom of page 5 of the specification as a UV resin, PVA-type adhesive agent or acrylic-type tacky adhesive agent.

Therefore, the Applicants believe that with the amendment of the claims and the above clarifications, the Examiner should remove the rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The Applicants have also provided a set of claim s as now in the application with this response.

With regard to the rejections of claim 1-7 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, the Applicants believe the amendments to the claims and the clarifications listed above resolve all of the Examiner’s concerns.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103**


The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatenable over the patent issued to Faris US Patent 6,359,664) in view of the patent issued to Okamoto (US Patent 6,147,738). The Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-7 and added new claims 8 - 27.

### **DOUBLE PATENTING**

The Applicants are prepared to file a Terminal Disclaimer with reference to co-pending application 09/874,415 prior to filing of any Issue Fee of Allowance of the claims.

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and an early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,




Gerow D. Brill

Registration No. 34,554

Reveo Inc.

Date: January 17, 2002  
Address: 85 Executive Blvd.  
Elmsford NY 10523  
Telephone: (914) 944-3163  
Facsimile (914) 944-3163  
E-mail [gerowpat@aol.com](mailto:gerowpat@aol.com)



Forming a polarizing film 3 by laminating  
a TAC film or CAB film and a drawn PVA film

Laminating the polarizing film 3 onto a transparent support 1  
with an adhesive agent interposed 2

Attaching transparent resist members 4 in specified  
positions (a) as shown onto the polarizing film

Filling spaces 8 (b) between said resist members 4 (a) with UV resin,  
PVA-type adhesive agent or acrylic-type tacky adhesive agent

Immersing items 1, 2, 3 4 and 8 in hot water and drying

Attaching protective member 9 to the resist members 4.

Bonding protective member 9 side of protected assembly  
to a display member 5.

**FIGURE 3**